

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	25/06/2015
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	25/06/2015
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Laura Hazelton			2015/2469/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
17 Edis Street London NW1 8LE			Please refer to draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of ground floor rear extension and alterations to rear fenestration including replacement of windows and doors on rear elevation by double height glazing.				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse permission			
Application Type:	Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	10	No. of responses	06	No. of objections	06
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed between 20/05/2015 and 10/06/2015. The application was also advertised in the local press on 21/05/2015 (expiring 11/06/2015).</p> <p>5 Objections have been received from surrounding occupiers on design and amenity grounds:</p> <p><u>43 Princess Road</u> The rear extension that extends to the back boundary wall is unacceptable; the extension at no.18 should not be a precedent, there will be a negative impact on the surrounding neighbours; there will be a loss of daylight and sunlight and it will negatively impact neighbouring outlook, the excessive use of glass detracts from the traditional Victorian architecture.</p> <p><u>59 Princess Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The corner windows do not accord with the general fenestration patterns of the street. The extent of the glazing will result in a loss of privacy; replacing the railings to the second floor terrace with a brick upstand would block sunlight and daylight; the single storey rear extension is unacceptable and no.18 cannot set a precedent, the extension would be an eyesore, blocking daylight and reducing privacy. Discrepancies between the drawings. The extension would affect the structural stability of no.59 Princess Road and the various party boundary walls. It would increase flood risk. <p><u>61 Princess Road</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extension should conform to the neighbouring properties, no.18 should not set a precedent. Concerns about the double height window. <p><u>57 Princess Road (1)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increased height of the extension will be oppressive; changing the window design is not in keeping with the street; the two storey glazing is out of keeping with the fenestration of the street. The boundary lines on the plans are incorrect. <p><u>57 Princess Road (2)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The window designs are not in keeping with the fenestration of the street; the new brick upstand will be oppressive; the two storey glazing would compromise the general pattern of fenestration of the street and would result in overlooking; the proposed extension is unacceptable and no.18 should not set a precedent. The plans do not show the correct ground levels or boundary lines. 					

**CAAC/Local groups*
comments:**
*Please Specify

Primrose Hill CAAC were notified by email on 14/05/2015 and object on design and amenity grounds:

- The proposals are directly against Camden Planning Guidance and the extension at no.18 does not provide a valid precedent as it precedes the most recent CPG & LDF.
- These gardens are visible as a green area between Edis Street and Princess Road. The proposal would harm this and set a negative precedent.
- The extension would harm the sense of openness in the rear garden, which would negatively impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The replacement window at rear ground floor level would be harmful to neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking and light pollution.

Site Description

The application property is a three storey mid-terrace property on the east side of Edis Street. The property is constructed in London stock brick with decorative stucco features to the front elevation.

The property is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. Although not a Listed Building, the property is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

It is a single dwelling house and is subject to an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights regarding extensions and alterations. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with many properties on the street characterised by roof extensions in a variety of styles and sizes.

Relevant History

Application property

PEX0000862 - The erection of a first floor rear extension for residential use and the provision of a roof terrace with metal balustrades at first/second floor level and formation of new access gate to basement level – Granted 27/11/2000.

PEX0200713 - The erection of a mansard roof extension with two dormer windows at front for additional accommodation to existing single family dwelling house – Granted 23/12/2002 – works not implemented.

2013/8239/P - Erection of mansard roof extension and single storey rear extension at lower ground floor and replacement of first floor rear window to residential dwellinghouse – Granted 12/03/2014 – works not implemented.

2015/2696/P - Construction of roof extension with rear dormer – application currently under consideration.

N.B. No planning records exist for the full-depth extension at neighbouring property no.18 Edis Street.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2015, consolidated with amendments since 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement 2000

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 The proposal involves the following:

- New full-depth single storey rear extension which follows the line of the existing three storey rear extension, with new sliding doors along the side elevation.
- Removal of existing rear ground floor patio doors and first floor rear window and replacement with two storey glazing.
- New window to the rear of the existing extension at first/second floor level.

Revisions

1.2 The proposal originally also included:

- The replacement of the existing metal balustrade with a brick upstand on the roof terrace on top of the rear extension.
- The lowering of the ground level of the whole property and garden by 500mm.
- A new window in the side elevation of the existing rear extension at first floor level and two wrap-around windows on the corner of the existing extension at first and second floor level.

1.3 These details were removed from the proposal at the officer's request. No basement impact assessment had been provided and the proposal for excavation could therefore not be fully assessed; the new windows were considered to harm the privacy of neighbouring occupants due to increased overlooking; and the new brick upstand was considered to negatively harm the appearance of the property due to excessive bulk.

1.4 The applicant was also informed that the single storey rear extension is contrary to design guidance and not considered a subordinate addition to the host property, but they did not wish to remove this element from the proposal.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main planning considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- Design (the impact that the proposal has on the character of the host property as well as that of the wider Primrose Hill Conservation Area); and
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the amenity of adjoining occupiers).

3.0 Design and Impact on the Conservation Area

3.1 Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards from developments. Policy DP24 also states that the Council will require all development, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties as well as the character and proportions of the existing building. Furthermore, Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas.

Single storey rear extension

3.2 CPG1 (Design) offers further detailed design guidance, stating that extensions should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings. Extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless the specific circumstances of the site, such as the context of the property or its particular design, would enable an exception to this approach (para. 4.8).

3.3 Rear extensions should: be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing; respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style; respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space; not cause loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure; allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area (para. 4.10).

3.4 Similarly, the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement states that where rear extensions are acceptable, they should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the conservation area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but its general effect on neighbouring properties and conservation area will be the basis of its suitability (PH26). Furthermore, Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings. The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances (PH27).

3.5 Although a single storey full width rear extension of a similar footprint was previously approved (reference 2013/8239/P), the currently proposed full depth rear extension is considered unacceptable due to its location, bulk and scale. By projecting outwards from the existing rear extension up to the rear boundary, the proposal projects further than the adjoining extensions which is contrary to the character of the adjoining terrace of properties. Although the amenity space is of a similar size to the previously approved application, the long strip now enclosed by rear extensions is also considered to be a less usable space that is not harmonious to the existing pattern and character of gardens here. The proposal is therefore considered to harm the character and appearance of the host property as well as the wider conservation area.

3.6 It is noted that although the adjoining property no.18 Edis Street benefits from a two storey full depth rear extension, it is a historical development that was erected without the benefit of planning permission prior to current Camden planning policies and design guidance. This development is therefore not considered to set a valid precedent.

3.7 The current proposal is considered an unsympathetic, bulky addition that fundamentally alters the form and character of the property and surrounding terrace. The nearby terrace is predominantly characterised by single storey rear infill extensions. The proposed rear extension would go against the grain of development in the surrounding area and is therefore considered to harm the character and appearance of the host property as well as the wider conservation area. It would also result in an increased sense of enclosure and overdevelopment in the rear garden landscape by virtue of the increased depth of extension to the rear wall and its proximity to neighbouring gardens. Although the applicant has proposed to install a green roof on top of the extension, it is not considered that this would overcome the harm caused by the development.

Windows

3.8 CPG1 (Design) offers further guidance relating to the installation of new or replacement windows. New windows should match the originals as closely as possible in terms of type, glazing patterns and proportions, opening method, materials and finishes, detailing and the overall size of the window opening (para. 4.7). The proposal sees the removal of an attractive original first floor rear window and later ground floor patio doors, and their replacement with a large, unsympathetic two storey glazed facade which is contrary to Camden's design guidance in terms of its size, style or materials.

3.9 The surrounding terrace is characterised by a strong window pattern along the rear elevation, and the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The Council is particularly reluctant to see the loss of the first floor sash window.

3.10 The proposal also includes the installation of a new window at first floor level to the rear of the existing extension. This development is considered acceptable as it is positioned in the same location as an existing window and is therefore not considered to cause additional harm in design terms.

3.11 On balance, the proposal is considered unacceptable in design terms.

4.0 Amenity

4.1 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore, Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight.

Single storey rear extension

4.2 CPG6 (Amenity) offers more detailed guidance with regards to the impact of development on neighbours in terms of access to daylight, overlooking, privacy and outlook. Chapter 6 highlights the Council's aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers; whilst chapter 7 discusses the council's aim to ensure development is designed to protect the privacy of existing dwellings.

4.3 The proposal would not result in additional loss of light and outlook to the neighbouring property at no.18, even though it will be enclosed on both sides in conjunction with its own rear extension. The rear garden at no.18 is already enclosed by an existing high fence and trellis on the side, thus the additional height of approx. 0.3m by the new extension would be minimal and not create a serious loss of daylight to no.18's windows according to BRE criteria nor create a serious loss of outlook and greater sense of enclosure.

Windows

4.4 The proposed windows are located in the same position as existing windows and doors on the rear elevation and are therefore not considered to cause additional harm to the amenity of neighbours in terms of a loss of privacy or overlooking.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal, by reason of the size, location and bulk of the rear extension and the expanse and design of glazing, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider terrace, would increase the sense of enclosure in the rear garden landscape, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013. In this case, it is considered that the scheme does not preserve this character.

5.2 Therefore, it would be contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

6.0 Recommendation.

Refuse planning permission.